DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 101 SP 032 399

AUTHOR Gomez, Mary Louise
TITLE Learning To Teach Writing: Untangling the Tensions between Theory and Practice.
INSTITUTION National Center for Research on Teacher Education, East Lansing, MI.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jan 90
NOTE 42p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Center for Research on Teacher Education, 116 Erickson Hall, College of Education, Michigan State Univ., East Lansing, MI 48824-1034 ($5.20).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Influences; *English Teacher Education; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Homogeneous Grouping; Labeling (of Persons); Secondary Education; *Secondary School Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods; *Theory Practice Relationship; Track System (Education); *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Florida Performance Measurement System

ABSTRACT

This paper tracks the changes in beliefs and dispositions regarding the teaching of writing of a cohort group of prospective secondary teachers during their graduate year of teacher preparation. Changes in the prospective teachers' beliefs regarding the knowledge they need to teach and the ways in which learners who differ in race, social class, and writing skills benefit from different curriculum and instruction are documented with data collected in interviews and questionnaire responses. The final section of the paper contains observations designed to assist teacher educators in questioning the structure and content of programs which will successfully prepare teachers of writing for diverse populations. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED322101

Research Report 89-7

Learning to Teach Writing: Untangling the Tensions Between Theory and Practice

Mary Louise Gomez

NCRTE

National Center for Research on Teacher Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. L. Gomez
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Sponsored by the United States Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

Research Report 89-7

LEARNING TO TEACH WRITING: UNTANGLING THE TENSIONS BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE

Mary Louise Gomez

Published by

The National Center for Research on Teacher Education
116 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

January 1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. L. Gomez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This work is sponsored in part by the National Center for Research on Teacher Education, College of Education, Michigan State University. The National Center for Research on Teacher Education is funded primarily by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily represent the position, policy, or endorsement of the Office or the Department.

National Center for Research on Teacher Education

The National Center for Research on Teacher Education (NCRTE) was founded at Michigan State University in 1985 by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

The NCRTE is committed to improving teacher education through research on its purposes, its character and quality, and its role in teacher learning. NCRTE defines teacher education broadly and includes in its portfolio such diverse approaches as preservice, inservice, and induction programs and alternate routes to teaching.

To further its mission, the NCRTE publishes research reports, issue papers, technical series, conference proceedings, and a newsletter on contemporary issues in teacher education. For more information about the NCRTE or to be placed on its mailing list, please write to the Editor, National Center for Research on Teacher Education, 116 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034.

Director:	Mary M. Kennedy
Associate Directors:	Robert E. Floden G. Williamson McDiarmid
Editor:	Sandra Gross

Many papers published by the NCRTE are based on the Teacher Education and Learning to Teach Study, a single multisite longitudinal study. The researchers who have contributed to this study are listed below:

Marianne Amarel
Deborah Loewenberg Ball
Joyce Cain
Sandra Callis
Barbara Camilleri
Anne Chang
David K. Cohen
Ada Beth Cutler
Sharon Feiman-Nemser
Mary L. Gomez
Samgeun K. Kwon
Magdalene Lampert
Perry Lanier
Glenda Lappan
Sarah McCarthey
James Mead
Susan L. Melnick
Monica Mitchell
Harold Morgan
James Mosenthal
Gary Natriello
Barbara Neufeld
Lynn Paine
Michelle Parker
Richard Prawat
Pamela Schram
Trish Stoddart
M. Teresa Tatto
Sandra Wilcox
Suzanne Wilson
Lauren Young
Kenneth M. Zeichner
Karen K. Zumwalt

Abstract

This paper tracks the changes in beliefs and dispositions regarding the teaching of writing of a cohort group of prospective secondary teachers during their graduate year of teacher preparation. Changes in the prospective teachers' beliefs regarding the knowledge they need to teach and the ways in which learners who differ in race, social class, and writing skills benefit from different curriculum and instruction are documented with data collected in interviews and questionnaire responses. The final section of the paper contains observations designed to assist teacher educators in questioning the structure and content of programs which will successfully prepare teachers of writing for diverse populations.

LEARNING TO TEACH WRITING: UNTANGLING THE TENSIONS BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE*

Mary Louise Gomez**

I probably thought about being a teacher when I was a junior in high school. And I really got interested in it when I was a senior because I was in an AP English class and I really liked my teacher a lot. And I was really interested in English. And basically, I made my decision and I really haven't ever changed my mind. (Stephanie I, p. 1)

Well, I guess we were or I was expecting a cooperative audience. . . . The thing I hadn't expected was having to stop things and discipline or the fact that some things just wouldn't go over and that the students wouldn't like it, wouldn't understand it. (Sheila II, p. 19)

My black students and my white students have completely different cultures. They have the same inculturation that America, you're inculturated to be an American, but that's such a broad term. Black kids from the ghetto don't know about the same things that white kids from the middle and upper middle class know about. And you treat them differently. (Sena I, p. 37)[1]

Introduction

The words of Stephanie, Sheila, and Sena illustrate the essential dimensions of conflict faced by prospective teachers enrolled in the graduate program of secondary English teacher preparation at a large university in Florida (here called State University). Lifelong writers and readers, they are intrigued with the subject matter of English; all have completed a bachelor's degree in the subject prior to entering their graduate program of teacher preparation. They are prospective teachers who enjoy reading, write for pleasure in their free time, and believe their experiences with English can also benefit others, that, as one teacher candidate says,

> [English] is something that will reach people. I think English is one of the best subjects to reach [people], to get people to think about themselves and think about what they are doing and [about] other people. (Shirley I, p. 1)

Yet, these young teachers find, in one year, that a passion for language and the experiences of being good writers and readers is not sufficient to meet the challenges of

---

*An early draft of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association meeting, San Francisco, March 1989.

**The author acknowledges the helpful comments on drafts of this paper by Maureen Gillette, B. Robert Tabachnick, and Kenneth Zeichner, colleagues at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Susan Melnick and Mary Kennedy of Michigan State University.

teaching writing to diverse secondary school learners. While they began their graduate year of teacher preparation concerned with the sufficiency of their subject matter knowledge, they end the year lamenting their inadequate knowledge and skills of classroom management. While they began their graduate year of teacher preparation with beliefs that all learners can learn to write via a process approach, emphasizing drafting, peer editing and publishing, they end the year questioning these beliefs. While they began their teacher education program with the belief that as teachers they could instill what Escalante calls "ganas," the desire to learn, in all of their students, they ended the year uncertain this was possible.[2]

These changes took place between October 1987, when the prospective teachers entered their first practica, and May 1988, when they finished 10 weeks of student teaching. Although the concern for developing skills of classroom management is often found in beginning teachers,[3] the shift in these teachers' beliefs regarding the knowledge they need to teach and the ways in which learners who differ in race, social class, and writing skills benefit from *different* curriculum and instruction warrant the attention of teacher educators and policymakers for three reasons. First, the role of subject matter preparation in developing good teachers is the focus of much debate in education today as policymakers, teacher educators, and social reformers attempt to increase the quality of teaching and learning in U. S. schools.[4] The current program of secondary teacher education at State University began in 1985 after several years of planning based, in part, on concerns for teachers' subject matter preparation. The outcomes of this work, especially the curriculum and instruction developed by its graduates, are of interest to stakeholders in current reform efforts.

Second, policymakers in Florida led other states in enacting legislation demanding specific practices of beginning teacher evaluation. The program of evaluation is known as the Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS). Study and practice of the behaviors required by the FPMS is a focus of the curriculum in the State University teacher education program, shaping the ways in which teaching, learning, and subject matter are conceived. Study of the outcomes of such a teacher education program provides a unique opportunity for teacher educators and policymakers to learn as other states enact similar policies and requirements.

Third, the United States is facing a dramatic growth in its population of persons who are poor, persons of color, and persons with a non-English language background; estimates of the percentage of persons of color enrolling in U. S. public schools by the year 2000 range from 30-40 percent[5] and numbers of non-English language background learners are also expected to increase greatly (e.g., numbers of Hispanic Americans are expected to grow from 14.6 million in 1988 to 47 million by the year 2000).[6] Yet, the percentage of teachers of color are expected to shrink from 11-12 percent in the 1980s to 5 percent by the year 2000[7]

as fewer persons of color enter the profession and higher proportions of black than white teachers leave the profession.[8] Students of color, students from poor families, and students in low-ability groups--those who most troubled the new teachers in this study--have historically been poorly served by American schools.[9] The problems that these beginning teachers, well intentioned, well grounded in their subject matter, encountered in their graduate year of preparation deserve attention as we untangle the issue of how to successfully prepare teachers for *all* students coming to our schoolhouse doors.

Background of the Study and Methodology

The teaching and learning of writing has received a great deal of attention by researchers since Braddock's call for work in the field in 1963.[10] There is a growing literature regarding writing and the teaching of writing; it includes research on the cognition and control of writers,[11] the composing processes of emerging writers,[12] the ways in which classrooms are organized for writing instruction of elementary-aged children,[13] the ways in which classrooms are organized for writing instruction of middle and secondary school-aged students,[14] and research on effective practices for the teaching of writing.[15] While some research has been conducted regarding how prospective teachers learn to teach writing, we have only begun to understand the processes of learning to write and learning to teach writing.[16]

Further, teacher educators concerned with preparing skilled, new teachers to teach writing to the growing numbers of diverse U. S. secondary school students have few resources upon which to draw.[17] The seminal work of Mina Shaughnessy in teaching college-level basic writers[18] has generated studies of the language learning of low socioeconomic status elementary-aged children and their teachers in the Carolina Piedmont,[19] the investigation of the family literacy activities of successful black first-grade children,[20] research concerning effective practices of computer use to improve the writing skills of non-English language background elementary students,[21] testimony regarding the value of linking the study of language and culture with publishing the work of university-student basic writers from many different national and language groups,[22] and Delpit's critiques of process approaches to teaching writing to low socioeconomic status students of color.[23] We may better know how to use these existing resources as we increase our understandings of how prospective teachers learn to teach writing.

In efforts to increase our understandings of these processes, researchers at the National Center for Research on Teacher Education (NCRTE) at Michigan State University have begun studying how preservice, beginning, and inservice teachers are learning to teach writing to diverse learners in nine teacher education programs in the U. S. In three of these teacher education programs in the NCRTE Teacher Education and Learning to Teach Study

(TELT) we examined the preparation of secondary English teachers. This paper draws on data from the TELT Study. In the first part I provide background concerning the state university program of teacher education and the students enrolled in the program; in the second section I describe and track over a one-year period the knowledge, beliefs, and dispositions concerning writing and the teaching of writing of a group of 31 graduate students (enrolled at a large state university) preparing to teach writing to secondary school students; in the third part I analyze the factors leading to changes in these teachers' beliefs and dispositions concerning the teaching of writing to diverse secondary learners. Finally, I offer observations designed to assist teacher educators in developing programs which will successfully prepare teachers of writing for diverse secondary school populations.

Data for the study were collected via three instruments developed at the NCRTE to track the learning of the prospective, beginning, and inservice teachers participating in various programs of teacher education: a questionnaire, an interview, and a guide for observing classroom teaching practices.[24] The instruments examine the participants' knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the following domains: subject matter and curriculum, students, teaching and learning, and classroom context. The questionnaires are designed to explore teachers' beliefs and knowledge in each of the domains and the interviews and observation guides are designed to explore how teachers' thinking interacts with their practices of teaching. A cohort group of 31 graduate students (reduced to 28 by the end of the year) was administered the questionnaire and a randomly selected group of 8 was given the interview (in October 1987 and April 1988) as well.

The State University Program of Secondary Teacher Preparation

Structure of the Program

The State University graduate program of secondary teacher preparation offers a master's degree in education and certification to teach in English, foreign language, mathematics, science, or social studies in grades 7-12. In 1987, when the TELT study of the State University program began, 31 graduate students were enrolled in the English teacher preparation component of the program. This was the largest subject matter group in the program, the smallest was foreign language with one student enrolled. All teacher candidates enrolled in the State University graduate program completed a bachelor's degree in their subject matter, maintained a 3.0 grade point average in their undergraduate coursework, and scored 1,000 or above on the Graduate Record Exam prior to program admission.

The chair of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction described the goals of the English teacher preparation program at State University this way:

> [The program] is characterized by two aims. The first is that professional teachers should know not only the content of their discipline but the emerging research base that supports how we teach that discipline. The second aim is to develop professional teachers who adopt practices that match what we know about how children learn, who reject practices that conflict with that knowledge. . . . Of course, we are also struggling to prepare teachers to cope with what they will find in the schools, and still hold onto a higher standard for themselves, striving to teach as well as they know how.[25]

The program requires 36 hours of coursework, two 3-week practica, and 10 weeks of student teaching; typically, teacher candidates work for two summers and one academic year to complete the program. Prospective teachers in all subject matter areas enrolled together in the Fall of 1987 in a general teaching methods course called Effective Teaching in the Secondary School. This course lasted half the semester and focused on the domains of the Florida Performance Measurement System and the research concerning effective teaching practices in which the FPMS is grounded (e.g., the effective use of praise to encourage the conduct of elementary aged students and to correct misconduct in the higher grades).[26] Students listened to lectures, read and discussed expectations for teacher behaviors and learner outcomes, watched videos of teachers conducting FPMS-based lessons in various subject matters, and were tested concerning their knowledge of the domains.

This course was followed in the second half of the semester by another on teaching methods designed for specific subjects; the English methods course, for instance, focused on how to teach writing and literature. The 31 English teacher candidates were randomly divided into two groups for class-size purposes; each group read research concerning a process approach to the teaching of writing, planned lessons, and completed other assignments (e.g., developing a file of 100 good activities for teaching English) related to teaching literature and writing during the course.

The prospective teachers also participated in two field experiences during the fall semester; one placement was in a middle school and one in a high school. The two practica required prospective teachers to observe for the majority of each half-day in the classroom and to teach for one class period. The grade and ability level, as well as the racial and cultural compositions of the classes taught in the practicum, varied from teacher candidate to teacher candidate. Each practicum lasted approximately three weeks under the supervision of two of the three faculty working in the English component of the program (the third secondary English faculty member was the chair of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University and did not supervise student teachers). Placements were made in the county in which the university was located as well as in surrounding, more rural, counties.

In the spring semester of the academic year, the prospective English teachers enrolled in one of two sections of a course called Teaching Language and Composition. Here prospective teachers read theory concerning the teaching of writing, wrote a research paper and a book critique, and kept a journal regarding the reading assignments. During the spring semester, they also participated in a 10-week student teaching experience in either a middle or high school; again, these experiences were supervised by two of the three program faculty. The prospective teachers' experiences varied in terms of grade and ability level taught as well as by racial and cultural composition of the classes.

Faculty Views

The three intertwined themes which mark this program of English teacher education are (a) an approach to teaching writing emphasizing processes of drafting, revising, and publishing, (b) views of learners which emphasize differences in individuals' styles of writing, and (c) a focus on the domains of the Florida Performance Measurement System as ways of organizing curriculum and instruction.

The Teaching of Writing

The three secondary English faculty members, Professors Sage, Sinclair, and Slade, held similar views concerning the best practices in the teaching of writing. Both Sage and Slade had been involved in National Writing Project staff development programs and all three advocated teaching that emphasized making writing enjoyable and downplaying attention to correctness on drafts of students' work. Professor Slade represented the viewpoints of the faculty when he stated:

> My belief about the teaching of writing [is] that writing is a process, that the process is teachable, that we need to be giving students positive opportunities to experience that process and not necessarily impose that as the only model of writing on students. (Slade II, p. 16)

Teaching writing as a recursive cycle of drafting, revising, and publishing was elaborated upon in the program through readings, lectures, discussions and faculty encouragement of the prospective teachers to bring their students' writing to class to share.

Learners

The faculty also appeared to agree about the variety and nature of learners present in public schools. Professor Sage, for example, discussing what she hoped her prospective teachers would learn about students, remarked on "the range of differences, the utter variety of human beings that you have in a group, any group of 25 or 30 or so." Her primary goal

was for her students to learn "a responsibility for adjusting to individual differences" (Sage I, p. 10). Her colleagues, Professors Sinclair and Slade, define differences in learners as differences in individuals' preferred styles of writing. Sinclair explained that through discussion of their own styles of writing, his students come to understand that "everyone writes differently":

> They discovered that there are some people who outline first. There are some people who do the five-paragraph theme . . . there are some people who slop it down and then go back. And so they discover right away that there is a great deal of diversity in how people write. . . . I attempt to keep reminding them of this when they give assignments . . . that we not inadvertently exclude the opportunity for certain students to function in the way that they rather typically write. (Sinclair I, p. 19)

Slade concurs: "Every student is going to write differently in some ways. That the response is unique to the writing situation and the learner. . . . [The] students are not all the same . . . there is a range of skills" (Slade II, p. 23). During the interviews conducted and classes observed in 1987-88, faculty members did not discuss race, social class, gender, or handicapping co[illegible]tions as factors related to secondary students' variable skills in writing. Rather, Professors Sage, Sinclair, and Slade emphasized that learners were different and that individuals' particular styles or quirks of producing text should be honored.

The Florida Performance Measurement System

The domains of the FPMS and the ways teachers should develop curriculum and instruction to pass the FPMS are central issues in the secondary teacher education program at State University. The general course which begins the methods sequence for all prospective secondary teachers focuses on the six domains of the FPMS: planning, management of student conduct, instructional organization and development, presentation of subject matter, communication (verbal and nonverbal), and testing (student preparations, administration, and feedback). In the foreword to the Florida State Department document titled *Domains: Knowledge Base of the Florida Performance Measurement System* is the statement: "This volume . . . documents one hundred and twenty-one specific teacher behaviors that have been shown through research to be directly related to increased student achievement and improved classroom conduct."[27] It is these 121 teacher behaviors, based on teacher effectiveness research, which form the core focus of the general methods course at State University. Prospective teachers are taught these behaviors through readings, lectures, and viewing videos where the behaviors are demonstrated.

Professor Sinclair, the faculty member responsible for coordinating the English program, also co-teaches the general methods course and is a state FPMS "trainer of trainers"; he regularly offers staff development updates on the use of the assessment instrument. When supervising student teachers, he uses the FPMS evaluation instrument which stresses teacher behaviors of direct instruction and classroom management leading to on-task, well behaved, teacher-focused learners (see Appendix A). Although Professor Slade was both a new faculty member and new resident in Florida unfamiliar with the FPMS, he attempted to incorporate its use into his supervision. While he explained that he did not know enough about the specific instrument to use it effectively, he did take supervisory notes concerning student teachers' behaviors in relation to the domains of the FPMS. Following his observations of student teachers' practice, he held conferences in which he noted these strengths and weaknesses. Although she does not supervise student teachers, Professor Sage also endorsed attention to the FPMS in the teacher education program as new teachers' practice would be assessed using this evaluation instrument. She commented: "Forewarned is forearmed" (Sage I, p. 4). Professor Sage hoped that knowledge of the FPMS and the evaluation instrument would assist teachers in passing the required tests.

The Policy Context

There are a number of legislated policies (e.g., the Gordon Rule--explained below--and the FPMS) and staff development programs (e.g., the Florida Writing Project) which intertwine with state curriculum standards and the teacher education program in a complex fashion in Florida. To illustrate the complexity of the numerous influences on curriculum, instruction, and the assessment of teaching writing in Florida schools, I will examine the 10th-grade writing curriculum. The Gordon Rule legislation[28] resulted in the creation of a Writing Enhancement Program for Florida students in grades 10, 11, and 12.[29] Among the provisions of the program are lowered class sizes for teachers of writing courses and requirements for students to write one paper per week in these classes. The popular summer institutes of the National/Florida Writing Project in which many Florida teachers participate also advocate frequent writing, revising, and publishing by students at every level of composing skill.[30]

However, the state Uniform Performance Standards suggest a different English curriculum for students in different tracks: skills, average, and honors.[31] A cursory examination of the portion of the Grade 10 standards related to writing demonstrates that intended outcomes for "skills" students emphasize correct spelling, capitalization, and punctuation, as well as subject-verb agreement, the construction of simple and compound sentences, and writing a business letter and a set of clear directions (see Appendix B for a complete set of the Grade 10 Florida Uniform Performance Standards in English for skills,

average, and honors students). However, the guidelines for the average and honors students provide much greater emphasis on writing and revising multiple drafts in a variety of modes of discourse and for various audiences, all practices currently advocated by researchers of writing as effective for increasing writers' skills.[32] While a "skills" student may sit, like her peers in average or honors classes, in a room with only 24 other students, she may practice spelling or fill out sample employment forms, while her more skilled classmates write and share stories, poems, and essays.

A further factor affecting curriculum and instruction in writing is the potential effect of the use of the FPMS. Anticipation of the use of the FPMS may cause a beginning 10th-grade teacher to emphasize procedures of teaching writing that are more teacher-directed and teacher-centered than those activities of peer collaboration and editing writing which are supported by research and by the Florida Writing Project staff development programs.[33] It is unclear what effect this amalgam of policies will have on any one teacher or in a particular school; yet it is clear that State University prospective teachers entered schools in which their cooperating teachers negotiated policies which appeared confusing and sometimes conflicting in their intentions and outcomes.

The Students of State University

Demographic Data

All 31 teacher candidates in the secondary English program are white, 25 are females; 27 hoped to teach in towns and small cities, while 20 percent planned to teach in rural areas. The eight randomly selected cases are females, six of whom were between 21 and 23 years of age; one was 34, and one was 38 at the beginning of the TELT study. When the study began, six of the women were single, two were married, and three had children. Five of the six younger women were lifelong Florida residents. Like many of their peers, five of the six case study students had transferred to the State University campus after two years of college elsewhere. While the two case study teachers who were over age 30 had prior professional work experiences, the other six women, like the larger cohort group, had prior work experiences limited to part-time jobs to support their schooling.

Beliefs About Themselves as Writers

Among the arguments regarding the requisite knowledge, skills, beliefs, and dispositions for teachers of writing is a view that teachers of writing should themselves be writers. Proponents of this position, including teachers and researchers affiliated with the National Writing Project (NWP), a staff development project for teachers located in over 160 sites in the U. S. and other nations, hold that unless a teacher writes, he or she is

unable to understand the struggle of his or her student-writers. Among the 11 key assumptions of the NWP is "Teachers of writing must write themselves."[34] Tom Romano, a writing teacher affiliated with the University of New Hampshire Writing Program, represents well the viewpoint of this group of practitioners as he quotes one of his high school students, Aimee, regarding what teachers need to know to teach writing:

> Teachers, writes Aimee, should be experienced writers so they can understand what their students have to go through to write an interesting paper. They wouldn't have to be genius college professors to teach good writing. They just need to be loyal writers.[35]

Romano concurs with his student:

> Loyal writers. Not even published writers. Just loyal ones who do enough writing about personally and professionally important topics to see writing from the inside, to know which suggestions and strategies for writing ring true and which do not ring at all, but rather clang.[36]

The prospective teachers of State University are representative of those teachers Romano and others believe are especially well prepared to teach writing; they are writers who find pleasure in crafting a message for the page.[37] Evidence of the cohort group's positive beliefs about themselves as writers, their enjoyment of writing, and their writing in many different forms is located in their responses to questionnaire items and interview questions. For example, 86 percent of the group agreed with the questionnaire item "Writing is an enjoyable activity for me" and 73 percent agreed with the statement "I am a pretty good writer." The teacher candidates also responded to a questionnaire item asking in which of six types of writing activities they engaged. Their responses included the following: 78 percent write poetry, 87 percent write letters, 58 percent write in journals, 74 percent write reports, and 45 percent write short stories.

During interviews conducted in the Autumn of 1987 and Spring of 1988, the eight case study teacher candidates were asked about their experiences in writing and learning to write. All eight had written in personal journals as a source of pleasure and reflection at some point in their lives; several of them had begun to write in their journals as children and continued the practice as adults. Stella, the parent of a teenage daughter, talked about the value of writing in her journal.

> I sort of wrote things down, not even so much consciously for a purpose, just to try to understand certain things that were happening in my life and I found it was a real valuable tool, just psychologically. (Stella I, p. 4)

Another student, Shirley, discussed the value of her personal journal.

> I keep a journal of my own about how I felt when my [twin] sons started kindergarten. I write down monumental things like how different they were the first week after kindergarten and how I felt I was just going into the program as a new, scared-to-death beginning teacher. And I thought I'm not going to feel that way again. I'm not going to have anxieties [like this] ever again--I hope--and I write it down. This is my purpose of writing it. I have been keeping a journal since I was about twelve. So I look back every once in awhile to see how I was at that point in my life. (Shirley I, p. 6)

Occasionally Shirley looks back on this work and reworks a piece of writing.

> I always think one day I am going to really write something significant. I have those dreams. I write down my ideas. I'll jot things down. I have these files in an old notebook and sometimes I relook at them for class or something. In fact, I used one just recently and [the professor] thought it was wonderful. I hadn't looked at it for seven years. (Shirley I, p. 7)

A third student, Scarlett, also talked about the value a journal held for her; however, she spoke with greatest enthusiasm of several short stories she had begun and hoped one day to publish. Scarlett also reflected the common experiences of her peers when she talked about pleasant memories of writing from elementary and secondary school.

> I do remember 4th grade. . . . I also remember doing two reports. . . . One was on Hawaii. . . . I did illustrations and everything and that was fun. I remember doing well on that and [the teacher] liked that. . . . They were over 20 pages long . . . with all these illustrations like sugar cane. (Scarlett II, p. 4)

Another student, Sena, also discussed the pleasure which writing brought her. In addition to writing for assignments in graduate school, Sena had recently written an essay for a corporate contest and had submitted two journal articles concerning summer volunteer work she had conducted for an adult literacy research project at State University.

These prospective secondary teachers valued writing in varied forms and for different purposes; they knew writing as insiders who have studied writing as a discipline and practiced writing as a craft. However, it is clear as we follow them through their graduate year of preparation that being a writer is not sufficient to bridge the gap between knowing the discipline of English and sharing one's understanding with diverse secondary school students. It is clear that personally valuing writing in different modes of discourse and for different audiences than one's peers is not sufficient to enable prospective teachers to create classrooms where they enable diverse secondary learners to have similar experiences.

Beliefs About Learners, Writing and the Teaching of Writing

The Autumn

Understanding prospective teachers' beliefs about what it means to be good at writing allows us to better understand the criteria by which prospective teachers judge good writing and what experiences teachers feel are important to provide their students in order to foster good writing. The State University teacher candidates responded to questionnaire items concerned with factors contributing to good writing. Their responses generally reflect what researchers note as activities that enhance writers' skills, opportunities to draft and redraft work, opportunities to share one's writing with interested, genuine audiences, and opportunities to critique the writing of peers.[38]

The cohort group also expressed beliefs about learning and learners which are supported by research as contributing factors in learning to write. For example, 87 percent of the State University teacher candidates agreed with the statement "To be good at writing, you need to read widely." Further, Sena described what she would say to a new principal regarding goals for the year for a seventh-grade class:

> Assuming there is no specific curriculum that I have to abide by I would think providing them a good foundation in reading is something essential to the rest of their careers. If they enjoy reading, the rest of their vocabulary will increase, their knowledge of sentence structure will increase, a vast majority of complex things they will have to do in the future will be aided by their ability and desire to read continuously. This is the most important thing I would teach them, try to instill in them. (Sena I, p. 7)

Smith and Beck[39] have recently argued that such reading skill does foster increased facility in writing.

In the Fall of 1987, the cohort group also expressed beliefs about the ability of all learners to acquire writing skills. The importance of such dispositions towards learners has been noted as a critical factor in students' achievement.[40] Positive beliefs about all learners are evident in the cohort group's responses to questionnaire items: 60 percent of the cohort disagreed with the statement, "There are some students who can simply never be good at writing"; 85 percent of the group agreed that "All students have something important to write about"; and 85 percent agreed that "[all] students get better at writing by having opportunities to write." The prospective State University teachers began the year with beliefs about writing and the teaching of writing sanctioned by researchers for teaching writing to diverse learners.

Further, these prospective teachers were concerned, at the beginning of their teacher preparation program, about acquiring enough subject matter knowledge to serve their prospective students well. They were uncertain at this time about whether they knew enough about English to teach effectively. Two of the case study teachers noted deficits in their knowledge of grammar. Scarlett explained:

> I mean, I can write and you get your A's and your B's on your assignments, but you just don't remember the labels and things like that. And I've been working on that myself by using a Harcourt Brace Handbook, a college manual. They have exercises in there in each chapter, and I've just kind of been going through those. (Scarlett II, p. 2)

Six of the eight noted weaknesses in their subject matter preparation in literature, citing particular periods which they had not studied. One student noted Renaissance literature as her weak area.

> I have never taken a Renaissance literature class, for instance, but I think that if I am aware and I stay a few steps ahead and I take the initiative to fill in those places, that I will be okay, yet it is a concern. (Sheila I, p. 1)

At the beginning of their program, these teachers were anxious to be as prepared as possible to teach the breadth of the English curriculum. They assumed they would be called upon to demonstrate their understandings of grammar, literature, and composition. They anticipated they would need to take the initiative to remedy gaps in their subject matter knowledge. Whether or not staying one chapter ahead of one's students or "brushing up" on the terminology of grammar is sufficient to enable teaching about literature or grammar is open to dispute. However, these responses to interview questions in the fall demonstrate the teachers' foremost concern with their subject matter knowledge.

In the Fall of 1987, these prospective teachers embraced notions about teaching, learning, and learners which can be characterized as idealistic, though common (they believed everyone could learn and would want to learn) to beginning teachers who have few experiences with classrooms outside their own secondary school days. Many of these beliefs about the ways students learn to write--through guided activities of writing, rewriting, and publishing--were compatible with the research literature on learning to write. Yet, in less than seven months time, these teacher candidates' beliefs underwent major changes.

The Spring

The cohort group's beliefs regarding learners, learning, subject matter, and teaching changed in two ways from October 1987 to May 1988: First, the focus of their concerns moved from those regarding subject matter deficits of knowledge in the fall to worries about deficits of knowledge in discipline and classroom management by the spring. Second, their beliefs regarding different learners' ability to learn moved from beliefs that all learners can benefit from instruction in writing based on activities of drafting, revising, and publishing to confusion regarding the benefits of varied curriculum and instruction for different tracks of learners. Included in these changed beliefs was confusion concerning the benefits of instruction grouping for learners in different tracks. These changes are especially evident in the responses of the eight case study teachers when interviewed.

Changing Beliefs Regarding Subject Matter Knowledge and Classroom Management

Interview responses of the eight case study teachers demonstrate dramatically the teachers' changing beliefs regarding what they need to know to be effective writing teachers. Sheila's comments are representative of those of her peers concerning their increasing concerns with discipline and classroom management:

> But now when I look back at student teaching and I look at what did I learn out of it, learning how to discipline was one of the things I got out of it. (Sheila II, p. 13). . . . Well, I guess we were or *I* was expecting a cooperative audience . . . the thing I hadn't expected was having to stop things and discipline or the fact that some things just wouldn't go over and that the students wouldn't like it, wouldn't understand it. (Sheila II, p. 19)

Sena, too, bemoaned her inability to manage the classroom.

> No program prepares you for what goes on in the classroom today. My mother sat in on one of my classes. . . . She was absolutely astounded at the lack of discipline and the just gall some of the students have over what my mother considered a teacher to be an authority figure. I'm smarter than that; I know I have no authority in the classroom. But, she was appalled and frankly I was kind of embarrassed that the kids basically take over whenever they want to. And with 30 kids you've got 30 different disciplinary problems in one classroom at one time. In no more than 5 or 10 minutes [of] lecture there will be 5, 10 interruptions. (Sena II, p. 9)

The case study teachers had not expected to teach learners who were uncooperative or uninterested in learning. They were puzzled and frustrated as the egalitarian ideals with which they entered their year of graduate study were tempered by the construction of categories of learners supported by the state curriculum guidelines for three presumed ability

levels. The teacher candidates were challenged by teaching groups of learners with what they viewed as particular characteristics: high-ability, attentive groups competing for grades with one another who wrote for an audience of peers as well as low-tracked learners (often students of color or of non-English language backgrounds) who were difficult to manage as a group, and whose writing activities more frequently focused on individual clerical-type seatwork. It was especially difficult for them to engage the interests of the low-tracked groups; and neither the suggestions of their faculty and cooperating teachers nor their own past personal experiences appeared successful in increasing students' motivations or skills.

Changing Beliefs About The Benefits of Tracking Learners for Instruction in Writing

When asked to respond to two statements regarding grouping in April 1988, Sophie's and Sena's remarks represent their peers' confusion concerning grouping for the tracking and learning of writing. The TELT study interview asked the teacher candidates to respond to the following statement: "Teachers should avoid grouping students by ability or level of performance." Sophie responded this way, with ideas she said she first heard in her graduate classes:

> I don't think [teachers] should [group by ability] because I think if you put all the kids that get A's in a class together and all the students know who gets A's and who doesn't and you put these two together in a group, and if you can get cooperation flowing and they know that they're supposed not to be rude, I think that they can help each other and the student that doesn't do well can say things and realize, I had something to say, too. I don't think if you put all the A students together they're going to learn, they're just going to compete against each other and want to know who's going to get the better answer and then all the kids that don't do well, they'll . . . say we're like the stupid group back here and we don't know what we're going to say. I think that you should mix like if you have groups of four, have the two high-ability students and two low-ability and intermix them. (Sophie II, pp. 14-15)

Sena, too, says that as part of her graduate program she read material indicating that "heterogeneous groups are better than homogeneous groups." Sena explains her commitment to heterogeneous grouping:

> I strongly believe in heterogeneous groups. You have a leader in the group, you have a follower in a group, you have people who are in the middle. The leader can start out the group and then you become the observer of the group, and leave it up to the rest of them. If you run into any problems there's always going to be someone smarter, there's always going to be someone who can take charge, and then you can always take that person out of that position by

making them some other person in the group. They all have their little functions and you just change the functions. (Sena II, p. 16)

The next interview question asked the prospective teachers to respond to this statement: "Required high school courses should have separate classes for low-achieving and high-achieving students." Both Sophie and Sena appear to contradict their earlier statements concerning the value of heterogeneous grouping. Sophie states:

> Yes, I think that's how it should be. You should have basic skills kids, the average kinds, and the honors classes. . . . If you put somebody who's always gotten low grades in English classes and he's at a certain point where he or she just can't even tell a subject in a sentence and you put them in a class with students who know all that, they know subjects, verbs, and they want to get more challenging. They already had the basics and they want, they know subjects, verbs, and they want to get more challenging. . . . You don't want to leave those kids behind, that don't have the basics and then you're just going to bore the other students and if you have basic skills kids together, they're all about the same level. You can get them into the higher thinking also but first you have to get them to have the basics already and then when you have the honors kids, you find out they have the basics already and then you move up to the higher things quicker than you would and if you put them together, I don't think you can do that. It's hard enough as it is now because even in the average classes up and even in the classes themselves, you have students that are here and students that are up here and I think it would just make it even more difficult for a teacher and for the students to learn because some of them will really be bored. They're bored now and others then wouldn't grasp. You can't go too fast because they won't get it [the content]. (Sophie II, p. 16)

Sena, too, mentioned the "brighter" students would benefit from tracking when asked whether required high school courses should have separate classes for low-achieving and high-achieving students.

> You almost have to have a tracking system in. These are kids who in a regular classroom become bored and begin to dislike education. There are kids in that same classroom who are struggling to keep up and perhaps dislike education. If they're in a more homogeneous group among themselves, say compared to IQ or emotional level of whatever, they will feel more at home in that environment. I do not agree with students choosing what track they're in. But I think some portion of tracking is important. It's a real shame that you have to take all the smart kids in a class and put them in some other class, because then the class has no leaders and they're missing something, an enrichment portion. (Sena II, p. 17)

Sena explains that many of her ideas about tracking have been influenced by her experiences in her student teaching where she saw the benefits two students received from placement in the International Baccalaureate program. She understands how they feel better about school because they have like-minded peers with whom they can communicate. She, too, wishes for a similar experience.

> Frankly, I think I can understand it from a professional standpoint. Teaching, as much you're around people is dreadfully lonely, it's in the profession. I don't get to talk to anybody on my own level all day. All I do is talk down to kids who don't understand. So, I can almost understand why they would want to be in a more homogeneous group at times. (Sena II, p. 18)

Sena and Sophie were puzzled; the interplay of their personal needs for affiliation with like-minded others, the conflicting messages of their teacher education program--all learners can learn to write in the same way--and the realities of homogeneously grouped classes presented challenges to their ideals about the values of heterogeneity. The teachers' puzzlement led to their analysis of the roots of the low-tracked learners' problems and to their design of remedies for students' needs. The next section describes the teachers' analyses and their outcomes.

Beliefs About Low-Tracked Learners and the Writing Curriculum They Require

First, the teachers examined the prior life experiences of the low-tracked learners and found them deficient. Stephanie, for example, spoke to questions in the TELT interview about differences among students that are important to consider when planning for teaching. When asked about social class as a difference between students to consider, she stated,

> Social class you have to consider [because] that maybe someone from a lower class had not been exposed to as many outside experiences during the course of their lifetime. Like maybe they haven't been to Paris to see all the museums and cathedrals and such and so when you talk about it, they really, you know don't have any idea, you would need to provide more background information and more visual material, things like that. You have to think more about enhancing your lesson plan in order to accommodate for that. So I don't see it as any special chore or something like that. (Stephanie II, pp. 31-32)

When asked about differences among students that are important to consider in teaching writing, Stephanie also focused on the deficits of lower socioeconomic status students.

> The kind of school system [they came from] . . . did they have a good background and things like that. Their social class, have they been exposed to good literature, what a piece of good writing looks like, have they read it before. (Stephanie II, pp. 31-32)

The interviewer asked, "I don't want to make any assumptions, I want to ask you questions, you mean low SES kids would not have been exposed to good writing?" Stephanie replied, "Right, right."

The interviewer then asked, "And why not, why do you think they wouldn't have?" Stephanie replied,

> Well, I'm not saying all of them because they haven't seen their parents reading, you know, in the home as much because their parents have to spend more time at work, that kind of thing. (Stephanie II, p. 33)

Stephanie and her peers surmised that their students' poverty had left their parents with insufficient time to provide the literacy experiences and other cultural experiences required for later school success. As a consequence, they thought the students reached secondary school without the requisite skills, attitudes, and knowledge for success in English.

Second, the case study teachers projected the future occupational lives of the low-tracked learners. Since their students' economic futures looked bleak, tied to low-status, semiskilled or skilled labor-type employment, the State University teachers tailored their English curriculum to practical activities of writing which students would later need to compete for jobs. While talking about a group of young black men, Sena represents the views of her peers regarding the needs of low-tracked learners of color when she remarked:

> I want to be able to give them the skills that they think they need and they will practically need, as most of [them] aren't going to go into college, but the Air Force and the Army and [the service] wants most of these boys and you have to prepare them for the professional military exam that they have to pass. (Sena II, p. 19)

When asked by the interviewer, "What kinds of writing would you *not* work on? You told me the kinds you would work on, what kinds of writing would you *not* work on with these kids?" Sena responds:

> I wouldn't work on abstract themes, things they couldn't touch and feel, intangible elements. I don't think there's any need for a student who's a skills kid, who has a job at night and comes to school during the day to discuss freedom in the Soviet society as opposed to the American society. He knows

> what all this is about without having to write abstractly about it. I wouldn't have him make five-paragraph essays solely for the purpose of writing. I wouldn't make them do research papers. I wouldn't make them tell me in the vein of the research paper where they got all their information from. (Sena II, p. 19)

The outcome of Sena's analysis of her students' needs led her to design a writing curricula which would fit her vision of the learners' destinies.

Further analyses of the data suggest that the teachers found ways to blame others for their students' deficiencies. Families--not schools or societal forces--they decided, were to blame for learners' low motivation and weak skills. Sena, Stephanie, and their peers found a commonsense explanation for their students' failures and also created a curriculum they believed would benefit these same students. They began endorsing curriculum with a life-skills orientation, as well as one which filled in the gaps about cultural activities students had not experienced. Such curriculum did fit the state Uniform Performance Standards; yet it did not acknowledge nor honor the experiences students brought to school. While the teachers seemed satisfied with their explanations and proposals, they failed to see their plans were unlikely to increase students' motivation or assist students in moving beyond the type of labor for which their teachers predicted they were headed.

Discussion

This section is a further analysis of the findings related to the teacher candidates' changing beliefs concerning writing curriculum and instruction for secondary students of different tracks. Why did these prospective teachers adopt different beliefs about teaching, learning, and learners from those held prior to their classroom experiences? What was the relative influence of the teacher education program, the legislated policies of the state and the state curriculum performance standards on challenging the teachers' existing beliefs?

First, the data indicate that the teachers' changing beliefs do not easily fit categories framed by earlier work in teacher socialization. The changes in State University teachers' beliefs are not the result, as Hoy and Rees and others contend, of the powerful and homogeneous impact of the student teaching experiences on relatively malleable teacher candidates.[41] Neither do the data support Lortie's contention that student teaching impacts little upon what prospective teachers bring to the experience.[42] Rather, it appears that a set of interrelated features of the school context and features of the teacher education program combined to alter or challenge the teachers' beliefs. The salient factors include the teacher education program advocacy of a process approach to teaching writing, the teacher education program response to diversity as an issue of varied writing style, state policies concerning writing curriculum (including the Gordon Rule and the Writing Enhancement Program),

state policies concerning beginning teacher evaluation (the Florida Performance Measurement System) and the teacher education program's support of these policies, and state department of education curriculum guidelines for English courses in Grades 10-12 (the Uniform Performance Standards).

It is difficult to disentangle the relative influence of any of these factors in isolation, since the policies of any single stakeholder, such as the state or the teacher education program, were not always compatible. For example, the teacher education program concurrently advocated an approach to teaching writing with a diffused classroom control orientation (a process approach emphasizing student-to-student interactions of peer editing and teacher conferences with individual writers) and a design for teacher behaviors (the FPMS) which stressed a focal, predominant role for the teacher.

State policies, too, did not have clearly congruent outcomes. One illustration is the potentially conflicting intentions of the Writing Enhancement Program--to encourage greater numbers of writing assignments and concomitant teacher feedback to student work--with that of the state Uniform Performance Standards. While the intent of the Writing Enhancement Program (the curriculum implementation arm of the Gordon Rule) was across track and grade increases in student writing and teacher responses, the nature and length of writing assignments offered to low-tracked learners had the potential to vary greatly from those opportunities to learn to write extended to "average" and "honors" students whose teachers followed the curriculum standards. Grade 10 curriculum standards for "skills" students, for example, underscore what Nystrand and Gamoran call "clerical" activities of writing, an emphasis on the correct construction of segments of language (see Appendix B, Grade 10 Uniform Performance Standards).[43] This orientation seems unlikely to create opportunities to draft, revise, and polish the one paper per week that was intended by the Writing Enhancement Program.

Further, the interplay between the process writing orientation of the teacher education program and the schools' context created dilemmas for the prospective teachers. First, the Writing Enhancement Program, with its requirements for weekly production of assignments, and the teacher education program advocacy of teaching writing via a process approach appear to be at odds. There is an inherent tension between teachers' offering process-type writing opportunities for the crafting of multiple drafts of papers, with time for revising and peer response, and teachers' working within 40-minute class periods, compelled to collect one written product from each of their students each week. Second, the teacher education program advocacy of a process approach for all learners appears at odds with the state curriculum guidelines. The outcomes listed on the state Uniform Performance Standards indicate that "skills" students' English curriculum would not focus on the production of drafts

to be read, edited, and published for peers. Rather, the "skills" learners' work was aimed at perfecting pieces of language.

Finally, the teacher education program's lack of attention to the diversity of writers as other than issues of people writing in different ways or of people being diverse in their perspectives did not assist the prospective teachers in marshaling arguments against tracking, nor did this viewpoint help them sort through the conflicting messages of many stakeholders regarding the best teaching for diverse learners. The prospective teachers analyzed their low-tracked learners' knowledge, skills, and dispositions and devised a practical writing curriculum based on these students' socioeconomic status and future occupational requirements. In making and justifying decisions based on learners' socioeconomic status, Stephanie, Sena, and their peers were able to accomplish four ends: (a) They justified the tracking found in the schools; (b) they relinquished their own feelings of inadequacy with regard to classroom management, failure to motivate learners, and inability to increase learners' skills; (c) they reduced the dissonance between their program's advocacy of one way to teach writing and the schools' differentiated curricula; and (d) they maintained beliefs that they were helping students, preparing them to meet their likely occupational needs successfully.

Observations

Here, I make observations related to the experiences of beginning teachers at State University with the intent they will inform ongoing efforts at the reform of teacher education. First, to paraphrase Arthur Powell, "An addiction to the life of the mind is necessary, but not enough."[44] Sena, Sophie, Scarlett, and their peers were "addicted to the life of the mind"; they had, since childhood, used writing and reading as a means to thinking and pleasure. Yet, their insights into their own creative processes and the value of those experiences are clearly insufficient for helping secondary school students acquire similar understandings for themselves. Knowledge of literature and composition cannot simply be transferred to others, it must be coupled with an understanding of English as an *activity* of teaching and learning in secondary schools and with an understanding of the students (inclusive of their cultures and communities) who join us in these activities.

While teachers must make the transition to pedagogical thinking suggested by Feiman-Nemser and Buchman, they must also make a transition to thinking in ways that anthropologists and ethnographers think.[45] This means that teachers must *learn to learn* with and about their students, and honor the knowledge and experiences which students bring to school, studying with their students the patterns and purposes of language in their cultures and communities and analyzing those patterns and purposes in relation to those of others (e.g., Standard American English--SAE, Black English Vernacular--BEV). Skills of

speaking, reading, and writing are tools to be acquired; they enable us to accomplish our occupational and recreational goals as well as helping us survive on a daily basis. When teachers genuinely engage in studying language with their students, they teach writing, as Nystrand has suggested, as a "verb," a purposeful, goal-driven activity.[46]

Several teachers and researchers have recently offered us examples of such work.[47] Shirley Brice Heath's study of the habits and patterns of language use in the Carolina Piedmont led to engagement of teachers (enrolled in her graduate courses) in similar activities of language investigation; they, in turn, engaged their students in studying the patterns and purposes of language of those around them. The results were more skillful and more motivated student language-users. Similarly, Terry Dean and June Jordan recently told of classes they conducted at the university level where their goals as teachers were to produce students who were more able consumers and producers of texts. Dean's classes at the University of California-Davis purposefully honor the home cultures of the diverse student body and link them with the culture of the university via activities of learning to write--drafting, peer revising, and publishing. Dean structures topics for writing focused on issues of language learning and use, provides opportunities for students to share their work in culturally diverse peer response groups, and asks students to write class newsletters focused on generating knowledge about multicultural experiences. Jordan's classes at the State University of New York at Stony Brook studied Black English Vernacular and generated rules by which BEV is spoken and written. In so doing, they learned about the structure of English and the rules by which all languages and dialects are governed. The students also gained an appreciation for differences and similarities between speech and writing as well as rediscovering pride and pleasure in language they had learned (in school) was "incorrect."

I do not suggest that such dispositions regarding language learning are easily acquired. Yet, opportunities for such investigation can be offered in programs of teacher education. Prospective teachers of English can be asked to read the work of those who have successfully conducted these investigations and can be supported in conducting their own research. This work has the potential to assist prospective teachers in truly becoming students of language, rather than ineffective transfer-agents of mainstream culture, language, and attitudes.

Assisting prospective teachers, and in turn, their students, in becoming ethnographers of language will secure the outcomes Delpit eloquently argues must occur if the diverse learners in U. S. schools are to be well served:

> I suggest that students must be taught the codes needed to participate fully in the mainstream of American life, not by being forced to attend to hollow, inane, decontextualized subskills, but rather within the context of meaningful

> communicative endeavors; that they must be allowed the resource of the teacher's expert knowledge, while being helped to acknowledge their own "expertness" as well; and that even while students are assisted in learning the culture of power they must also be helped to learn about the arbitrariness of those codes and about the power relationships they represent.[48]

Graduate programs of teacher education are no more likely to produce the sorts of teachers Delpit calls for than other programs of teacher education unless they acknowledge and make problematic the racial, cultural, language, and socioeconomic factors influencing diverse learners' motivations to learn and skills of learning and the policies and practice of the institutions (state and school) into which they send prospective teachers. Teacher education programs must take into account what Apple and other critical theorists term the varying "cultural capital" with which students come to school.[49] Faculty need to help prospective teachers examine the complex socioeconomic and political factors responsible for differences in students' skills and dispositions as well as provide prospective teachers with opportunities for guided practice of effective teaching strategies for diverse learners.

Prospective teachers require opportunities to practice teaching which Giroux refers to as encompassing "a language of opportunity," teaching which does not predetermine and slot learners according to others' expectations but taps and builds upon the knowledge they bring to school. A "language of opportunity" honors the experiences, language, and culture which students bring to school and links those to the development of skills for which learners can determine future uses. In teaching writing, for example, we need to offer all students opportunities to write for real purposes and genuine audiences, to develop the ability to craft messages which will allow their voices to be clearly heard for whatever personal and professional uses *they* choose. This cannot be accomplished when teachers ignore differences in learners or when they blame the learners *or* their families for being lazy, uncaring, or lacking in mainstream cultural knowledge or experiences. A "language of opportunity" opens possibilities to learners. Yet, these cannot occur unless the experiences of diverse learners are examined within the lectures, readings, written assignments, and discussions of teacher education programs and in relation to the subject matter that prospective teachers will teach. Prospective teachers must confront dilemmas of theory and practice in both the rarified university atmosphere and that of the real world of schools. They must confront issues of diversity so that they can enact their ideals with all the learners in their classrooms.

In order to bring about programs of teacher education which empower new teachers to take risks as language learners with their students, programs must be constructed with strong links to school, community, and policy contexts. This does *not* mean endorsement of the goals and means of any single stakeholders; rather, it means teacher educators need to

make explicit and problematic the tensions existing between the needs and desires of any group or institution. Without such attention, prospective teachers are left alone to make sense of complex cultural and institutional webs. While some beginning teachers will surely teach in ways that honor their students' knowledge, beliefs, and dispositions, many others, equally well intentioned and well grounded in their subject matter, will endorse existing school practices and state policies which do not emancipate learners, but proscribe their skills and reshackle them to timeworn roles and expectations.

Notes

[1]All teachers' and students' names are pseudonyms. Quotes from interviews with prospective teachers and faculty at State University are marked by Roman numerals indicating the time interviews took place (e.g., I signifies a Fall 1987 interview, II indicates a Spring 1988 interview) and by page number of the location of the quote in the typed transcript of the interview.

[2]Ann Meeks, "On Creating Ganas: A Conversation with Jaime Escalante," *Educational Leadership* 46, no. 5 (1989): 46-48.

[3]For typical instances, see Frances Fuller, "Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Perspective," *American Educational Research Journal* 6 (1969): 207-26; and S. A. Veenman, "Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers," *Review of Educational Research* 54, no. 2 (1984): 143-78.

[4]See Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986); Holmes Group Executive Board, *Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group* (East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, 1986); and Lee Shulman, "Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching," *Educational Research* 15, no. 2 (1986): 4-14.

[5]Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1987); Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1987); William Georgiades, "The New America for the Third Millenium," in *Society, Schools, and Teacher Preparation: A Report of the Commission on the Future Education of Teachers* (Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1988); and Martin Haberman, "More Minority Teachers," *Phi Delta Kappan* 70, no. 10 (1989): 771-776.

[6]Migdalia Romero, Carmen Mercado, and Jose A. Vazquez-Faria, "Students of Limited English Proficiency," in *Educators' Handbook: A Research Perspective*, ed. Virginia Richardson-Koehler (White Plains, NY: Longman, 1987), 348-369.

[7]Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, "Equity Expert Faults Choice Plan," *ASCD Update* 3, no. 3 (May 1989): 2; Carl Grant and Maureen Gillette, "The Holmes Report and Minorities in Education," *Social Education* 51, no. 7 (1987): 517-521.

[8]Haberman, "More Minority Teachers."

[9]For a good discussion of this point see Ann Bastian, Norm Fruchter, Marilyn Gitten, Colin Greer, and Kenneth Haskins, *Choosing Equality: The Case for Democratic Schooling* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986).

[10]Richard Braddock, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and L. Schoer, *Research in Written Composition* (Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1968).

[11]Carl Bereiter and Marlene Scardamalia, *The Psychology of Written Composition* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1987).

[12]For excellent examples of the writing processes of emerging writers, see Glenda Bissex, *GNYS AT WRK: A Child Learns to Read and Write* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986); Ann Haas Dyson, "Individual Differences in Beginning Composing: An Orchestral Vision of Learning to Compose," *Written Communication* 9, no. 9(1987): 411-442; Ann Haas Dyson, "Drawing, Talking and Writing: Rethinking Writing Development" (Berkeley: University of California, Center for the Study of Writing, 1988).

[13]Lucy M. Calkins, *The Art of Teaching Writing* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, 1986); Susan Florio and Christopher Clark, "The Functions of Writing in an Elementary Classroom," *Research in the Teaching of English* 16 (1982): 115-130; Donald H. Graves, *Writing: Teachers and Children at Work* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, 1983).

[14]Nancie Atwell, *In the Middle* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, 1987); Harvey Daniels and Steven Zemelman, *A Community of Writers: Teaching Writing in the Junior and Senior High School* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, 1988).

[15]George Hillocks, Jr., *Research on Written Composition* (Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and the National Conference on Research in English, 1986); P. Martin Nystrand, "A Study of Instruction and Discourse" (Madison: University of Wisconsin, National Center for Research on Effective Secondary Schools).

[16]Renee Clift, "Becoming an English Teacher--Maybe" (Paper delivered at American Educational Research Association meeting, New Orleans, April, 1988); Pamela Grossman, "Colleen: A Case Study of a Beginning English Teacher" (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University School of Education, 1987); Pamela Grossman, "Martha: The Case Study of A Beginning English Teacher" (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University School of Education, 1987); Pamela Grossman, "Learning to Teach Without Teacher Education" (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April, 1987).

[17]Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education*; Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics*.

[18]Mina Shaughnessy, *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977).

[19]Shirley Brice Heath, *Ways With Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

[20]Denny Taylor and Catherine Dorsey-Gaines, *Growing Up Literate: Learning from Inner-City Families* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, 1988).

[21]Hugh Mehan, Luis Moll, and Margaret Riel, "Computers in Classrooms: A Quasi-Experiment in Guided Change" (San Diego: University of California, San Diego).

[22]Terry Dean, "Multicultural Classroom, Monocultural Teachers," *College Composition and Communication* 40, no. 1 (1989): 23-27.

[23]Lisa D. Delpit, "Skills and Other Dilemmas of A Black Educator," *Harvard Educational Review* 56, no. 4 (1986): 379-385; Lisa D. Delpit, "The Silenced Dialogue: Power and Pedagogy in Educating Other People's Children," *Harvard Educational Review* 58, no. 3 (1988): 280-298.

[24]Deborah L. Ball and G. Williamson McDiarmid, "Research on Teacher Learning: Studying How Teachers' Knowledge Changes," *Action in Teacher Education* I, no. 2 (1988): 17-23; National Center for Research on Teacher Education, "Teacher Education and Learning to Teach: A Research Agenda," *Journal of Teacher Education* 39, no. 6 (1988): 27-32.

[25]Margaret Early, "Acquiring Beliefs About Writing Instruction: From Taking Courses to Teaching Classes" (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, San Francisco, November, 1987).

[26]Florida State Department Office of Teacher Education, Certification and Staff Development, *Domains: Knowledge Base of the Florida Performance Measurement System* (Tallahassee, FL: Author, 1983).

[27]Ibid, p. i.

[28]Florida Public law 236.1223 states "Additional categorical funds for teaching writing skills" contain the following provisions:

> (1) This act shall be known as the "Jack Gordon Writing Skills Act of 1982."
> (2) Any school district which establishes a separate course for teaching writing skills, or which demonstrates that teaching writing skills is a primary emphasis in English courses included in its existing curriculum and required as a prerequisite for graduation, may receive categorical funds as provided in this section in addition to the funds it receives from the Florida Education Finance Program.
> (3) To be eligible to receive funds under this section, a school district shall certify to the Department of Education:
> (a) That instruction in writing skills is provided in classes which contain no more than 25 students per teacher and no teacher who teaches writing skills as part of the instruction in an English class that is a class required by the school district as a prerequisite for graduation teaches more than 100 students per day; however, the Commissioner of Education may approve alternative staffing plans, on an annual basis, submitted by a local district for those schools wherein there is a demonstrated lack of classroom space or a showing is made that the total instructional program requires teachers to instruct classes in English and another subject or subjects;
> (b) The number of full-time equivalent students as defined in s.236.013(2) who are enrolled in the basic 10-12 program and who receive instruction in writing skills as provided in paragraph (a);

(c) That it has complied with all criteria established by the Department of Education pursuant to this section.
(4) The Commissioner of Education shall establish specific criteria for determining whether the teaching of writing skills is a primary emphasis in an existing English course which a school district has required to be a prerequisite for graduation. Included in the criteria shall be a requirement that a student in such a course write not less than one essay, report, story, or other work product each week of class.
(5) The annual allocation to each district that is eligible to receive funds under this section shall be distributed to each such district by the Department of Education in the following manner:
(a) The school district shall receive an amount equal to 0.05 times the average number of students enrolled in such writing classes per day during survey weeks times the basic 10-12 program weight used in the Florida Education Finance Program times the Base Student Allocation used in the Florida Education Finance Program.
(b) If the number of dollars generated by using the formula provided in paragraph (a) for all eligible districts exceeds the appropriation made by the Legislature for the year, the department shall prorate each district's share of the appropriation.

[29]The Writing Enhancement Program in Florida contains two major provisions: (a) a reduced class size limiting to 100 students the number of learners in grade 10, 11 and 12 classes for teachers who primarily teach writing and (b) provision for approximately one paper per week to be collected from grade 10, 11 and 12 students enrolled in English classes.

[30]There are several National Writing Project (NWP) sites in Florida; here I refer to these with the generic name of the Florida Writing Project. Individual writing project sites often are named for their location in a state (e.g., the Northern Virginia Writing Project) or for a characteristic of the geography in the place they are situated (e.g., the Bay Area Writing Project). All NWP sites support process approaches to the teaching of writing and rely upon teachers' practical knowledge as well as theoretical knowledge to inform curriculum and instruction in writing.

[31]Use of the State Uniform Performance Standards are not mandates in that tracking in Florida secondary schools is not mandated (personal communication, Margaret Early, April 1989), yet no grade 10, 11, or 12 class in which the 1987-88 cohort of University prospective teachers practiced was *not* tracked. Conversations over the last two years with several Florida county language arts supervisors lead me to believe that ability tracking in Florida secondary schools is pervasive and that, while one can find schools which do not track, there are few of these.

[32]Hillocks, Jr., *Research on Written Composition*; and Nystrand, "A Study of Instruction and Discourse."

[33]For a discussion of this point, see Susan L. Melnick, "Contextual Influences on the Teaching of Writing" (Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, March, 1989).

[34]Bay Area Writing Project Staff, *National Writing Project Evaluation Portfolio* (Berkeley: University of California, School of Education, 1983).

[35]Thomas Romano, "Musts for Writing Teachers--What Students Say" (Paper presented at the Policy Conference of the National Center for Research on Teacher Education, Washington, DC, 1989), p. 3.

[36]Romano, "Musts for Writing Teachers," p. 4.

[37]Bay Area Writing Project Staff, *National Writing Project Evaluation Portfolio*.

[38]Arthur N. Applebee, *Writing in the Secondary School: English and Content Areas* (Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1981); Hillocks, Jr., *Research in Written Composition*; and Nystrand, "A Study of Instruction and Discourse."

[39]Frank Smith, *Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1988); Isabel L. Beck, "Improving Practice Through Reading Understanding," in *Toward the Thinking Curriculum; Current Cognitive Research*, ed. Lauren B. Resnick and Leopold E. Klopfer (Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1989).

[40]Jere E. Brophy and Mary M. Rohrkemper, "The Influence of Problem Ownership on Teachers' Perceptions of Strategies for Coping with Problem Students," *Journal of Educational Psychology* 73 (1981): 295-311; L. H. King, "Student Thought Processes and the Expectancy Effect" (Churchlands, Perth, Australia: Churchlands College of Advanced Education, 1980).

[41]William Hoy and William Rees, "The Bureaucratic Socialization of Student Teachers," *Journal of Teacher Education* 28 (1977): 23-26.

[42]Dan Lortie, *Schoolteachers: A Sociological Study* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

[43]P. Martin Nystrand and Adam Gamoran, "A Study of Instruction as Discourse," (Madison: University of Wisconsin, National Center for Research on Effective Secondary Schools, 1989).

[44]Arthur Powell, Eleanor Farrar, and David K. Cohen, *The Shopping Mall High School* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1985).

[45]Sharon Feiman-Nemser and Margret Buchman, "The First Year of Teacher Preparation: Transition to Pedagogical Thinking," Research Series No. 156 (East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, 1985).

[46]P. Martin Nystrand, "On Teaching Writing As a Verb Rather Than As a Noun," in *Essays on the Teaching of English*, ed. Gail Hawisher and Anna Soter (Albany: State University of New York at Albany Press, in press).

[47]See, for example, Heath, *Ways with Words*; Dean, "Multicultural Classrooms, Monocultural Teachers"; and June Jordan, "Nobody Mean More to Me Than You, and the Future Life of Willie Jordan," *Harvard Educational Review* 58, no. 3 (1989): 363-374.

[48]Delpit, "The Silenced Dialogue," p. 296.

[49]Michael W. Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum* (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979); Henry Giroux, *Theory and Resistance: A Pedagogy for the Opposition* (South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey, 1983; and Peter McLaren, *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education* (New York: Longman, 1989).

APPENDIX A

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
FLORIDA PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM
SCREENING/SUMMATIVE OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

Number of Students Not Engaged

1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐

DOMAIN		Tot. Freq.	Frequency	Frequency	Tot. Freq.	
3.0 Instructional Organization and Development	1. Begins instruction promptly					1. Delays
	2. Handles materials in an orderly manner					2. Does not organize materials systematically
	3. Orients students to classwork/maintains academic focus					3. Allows talk/activity unrelated to subject
	4. Conducts beginning/ending review					4.
	5. Questions: academic comprehension/ lesson development — a. single factual (Domain 5.0)					5a. Allows unison response
	5. Questions: academic comprehension/ lesson development — b. requires analysis/ reasons					5b. Poses multiple questions asked as one
						5c. Poses nonacademic questions/nonacademic procedural questions
	6. Recognizes response/amplifies/gives correct feedback					6. Ignores student or response/expresses sarcasm, disgust, harshness
	7. Gives specific academic praise					7. Uses general, nonspecific praise
	8. Provides for practice					8. Extends discourse, changes topic with no practice
	9. Gives directions/assigns/checks comprehension of homework, seatwork assignments/gives feedback					9. Gives inadequate directions on homework/ no feedback
	10. Circulates and assists students					10. Remains at desk/circulates inadequately
4.0 Presentation of Subject Matter	11. Treats concepts - definition/attributes/examples/ nonexamples					11. Gives definition or examples only
	12. Discusses cause-effect/uses linking words/applies law or principle					12. Discusses either cause or effect only/uses no linking word(s)
	13. States and applies academic rule					13. Does not state or does not apply academic rule
	14. Develops criteria and evidence for value judgment					14. States value judgment with no criteria or evidence
5.0 Communi-cation: Verbal and Nonverbal	15. Emphasizes important points					15.
	16. Expresses enthusiasm verbally/challenges students					16.
	17.					17. Uses vague/scrambled discourse
	18.					18. Uses loud-grating, high pitched, monotone, inaudible talk
	19. Uses body behavior that shows interest - smiles, gestures					19. Frowns, deadpan or lethargic
2.0 Management of Student Conduct	20. Stops misconduct					20. Delays desist/doesn't stop misconduct/deals punitively
	21. Maintains instructional momentum					21. Loses momentum - fragments nonacademic directions, overdwells

Observer's Notes: _____

_____

_____

Copyright
State of Florida
Department of State
1989

State of Florida
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida
Betty Castor, Commissioner
Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

NOTE: (Directions for completing the information required on this instrument are in the FPMS Coding Manual)

Frame Factor Information (Please Print)

Teacher's Name

_____ _____ _____
(Last) (First) (Middle)

SS# ___ ___ ___ - ___ ___ - ___ ___ ___ ___

Institution of Graduation_____ Inst.# _____

Graduated From a College of Education ☐1. YES ☐ 2. NO

Number of Complete Years of Teaching Experience ____ ____

District Name_____ Number ___ ___ ___

School Name_____ Number ___ ___ ___ ___

Observer's Name

_____ _____ _____
(Last) (First) (Middle)

SS# ___ ___ ___ -- ___ ___ -- ___ ___ ___ ___

Position ☐1. Principal ☐2. Ass't Principal ☐ 3. Teacher ☐ 4. Other

Class ___ ___ Grade Level (Specify one level only – For Adult Ed. mark Level 13; For Kindergarten or Preschool mark Level 00.)

Subject Area Observed

☐ 1. Language Arts
☐ 2. Foreign Language
☐ 3. Social Sciences
☐ 4. Mathematics
☐ 5. Science
☐ 6. Physical Education, ROTC
☐ 7. Business Education, DCT, CBE
☐ 8. Industrial Arts/Education
☐ 9. Home Economics
☐ 10. Other Vocational Ed.
☐ 11. Arts
☐ 12. Music
☐ 13. Exceptional Stud. Ed.
☐ 14. Other (Specify)_____

Type of Classroom/Facility in Which the Observation Occurred

☐ 1. Regular Classroom -- Self-contained, Open, Pod
☐ 2. Laboratory or Shop
☐ 3 Field, Court or Gymnasium
☐ 4. Media Room or Library

Total Number of Students in Class ___ ___

Observation Information Date ___ ___/___ ___

Type of Observation ☐1. Beg. Tchr. ☐ 2. Dist. Assessment ☐

Screening Obs. ☐ 1. ☐ 2. ☐ 3. ☐ 4.

Summative Obs. ☐ 1. ☐ 2. ☐ 3. ☐ 4.

Time Observation Begins ___ ___ : ___ ___ Observation En

Test Begins ___ ___ : ___ ___ Test Ends ___

Methods Used in the Observed Lesson

☐ 1. Lecture/Dictation/GuidedPractice/Recitation
☐ 2. Discussion/Interaction
☐ 3. Independent Study or Work
☐ 4. Laboratory or Shop Activity

Teacher's Signature_____

Observer's Signature_____

OTE 349
Exp. 3/31/90

APPENDIX B

Florida State Uniform Performance Standards:

Subject Area *Language Arts*

Course Title *English Skills II*

Course Number *1001330*

COURSE STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

After successfully completing this course, the student will be able to

1. Use literal and inferential comprehension skills.

   The student will
   - 1.01 determine the main idea, stated or implied, in a reading selection.
   - 1.02 answer "who," "what," "where," "when," "which," and "how" questions about a reading selection.
   - 1.03 determine the order of events in a reading selection.
   - 1.04 follow written directions to complete a task.
   - 1.05 identify an appropriate conclusion or generalization for a reading selection.
   - 1.06 determine the cause or effect (stated or implied) in a given reading passage.
   - 1.07 distinguish between fact and opinion in a reading passage.

2. Demonstrate knowledge of a basic vocabulary as determined by a specified word list.

   The student will
   - 2.01 identify words by sight.
   - 2.02 identify word meaning from a knowledge of word parts (prefixes, suffixes, base words) as used in a given context.
   - 2.03 identify word meanings in context using a variety of methods (e.g., example clues, direct explanation, synonym clues, and comparison/contrast clues).
   - 2.04 use appropriate vocabulary in writing.
   - 2.05 apply dictionary skills to determine definition, spelling and parts of speech.
   - 2.06 demonstrate knowledge of vocabulary on the Student Assessment Minimal List for Reading (SAML-R)

3. Demonstrate knowledge of fundamental conventions of standard written English.

   The student will
   - 3.01 use appropriate punctuation.
   - 3.02 use appropriate capitalization.
   - 3.03 write the plural form of nouns.
   - 3.04 spell words from the Florida Lists for Assessment of Spelling (FLAS).
   - 3.05 make subjects and verbs agree.
   - 3.06 use the appropriate forms of irregular verbs in writing.
   - 3.07 write simple and compound sentences.

4. Write multi-paragraph papers for a variety of purposes, using all stages of the writing process.

   The student will
   - 4.01 generate ideas for a composition through pre-writing activities.
   - 4.02 fill out common forms.
   - 4.03 write a business letter.
   - 4.04 write a set of clear directions.
   - 4.05 organize information related to a single topic.
   - 4.06 revise a draft of a composition.
   - 4.07 produce a legible final copy of a composition.

5. Use knowledge of elements of literary genres to read selections from world literature.

   The student will
   - 5.01 summarize the sequence of events in a piece of fiction or non-fiction.
   - 5.02 describe characters in a short story, novel and/or play.
   - 5.03 identify the setting in a short story, novel and/or play.
   - 5.04 identify the main idea in a literary selection.
   - 5.05 identify recurring themes in world literature (e.g., love, death, and courage).
   - 5.06 list the fundamental characteristics of biography and autobiography.
   - 5.07 read representative examples of selections from major literary genres.

6. Make formal and informal oral presentations.

   The student will
   - 6.01 participate in class discussions.
   - 6.02 summarize orally the main idea of a presentation.
   - 6.03 prepare and deliver a short oral report.

7. Understand the impact of mass media, including propaganda and persuasion techniques.

   The student will
   - 7.01 identify common persuasion and propaganda techniques.
   - 7.02 examine the content of various types of media to determine the purpose and/or audience for which they are designed.

8. Apply study skills.

   The student will
   - 8.01 use appropriate note-taking skills.
   - 8.02 use effective test-taking skills.
   - 8.03 obtain information from a variety of reference sources.
   - 8.04 obtain information from maps, charts, tables, graphs, schedules, pictures, or signs.

Subject Area *Language Arts*

Course Title *English II*

Course Number *1001340*

COURSE STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

After successfully completing this course, the student will be able to

1. Use literal, inferential and critical reading comprehension skills.

   The student will
   - 1.01 determine the following in a reading selection: stated or implied main idea, sequence of events or ideas, stated or implied cause or effect.
   - 1.02 identify generalizations and/or conclusions based upon a reading selection.
   - 1.03 distinguish between facts and opinions in a reading selection.
   - 1.04 apply reading skills for test-taking situations.

2. Use selected grade-level and content-area vocabulary.

   The student will
   - 2.01 demonstrate a knowledge of vocabulary words on the Student Assessment Minimal List for Reading (SAML-R), Grade 11.
   - 2.02 determine word meanings by using word parts and/or context clues.
   - 2.03 use an appropriate reference source to determine the derivation of words.
   - 2.04 identify synonyms, antonyms, and homonyms.
   - 2.05 answer word analogy questions.

3. Apply knowledge of grammar, usage, spelling, and mechanics.

   The student will
   - 3.01 use appropriate punctuation.
   - 3.02 use appropriate capitalization.
   - 3.03 apply rules for subject/verb and pronoun/antecedent agreement.
   - 3.04 use appropriate forms of pronouns and regular and irregular verbs.
   - 3.05 edit and revise written compositions to correct errors in grammar, usage, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.
   - 3.06 spell words from the Florida List for Assessment of Spelling (FLAS), grade 11.

4. Produce a variety of compositions using all stages of the writing process (prewriting, drafting, revising).

   The student will
   - 4.01 use prewriting, drafting, and revision skills in writing compositions.
   - 4.02 write a business letter.
   - 4.03 fill out common forms.
   - 4.04 write a narrative paper based upon personal experience and/or interviews.
   - 4.05 write a paper to defend a viewpoint

4.06 write for a variety of audiences.
4.07 write a summary of a written or oral presentation.
4.08 write papers demonstrating various types of organizations, such as definitions and comparison/contrast.

5. Apply knowledge of elements of literary genre to selections from world literature.

The student will
5.01 explain a fictional work in terms of plot, setting, characterization, conflict, theme and point of view.
5.02 identify the theme of a poem.
5.03 identify recurring themes in world literature (e.g., love, death, courage).
5.04 identify the author's purpose in a literary work.
5.05 identify literary devices in a literary work.

6. Make and critique formal and informal oral presentations.

The student will
6.01 participate in oral classroom activites, such as discussion and the reading or various literary passages.
6.02 prepare and present a formal speech intended to explain, to persuade or to entertain.
6.03 evalute an oral presentation using established criteria.

7. Use reference skills.

The student will
7.01 use appropriate note-taking skills.
7.02 use reference sources to find information on a specific topic.
7.03 use a dictionary, a thesaurus, and similar reference books.

8. Understand and evaluate the impact of mass media, including propaganda and persuasion techniques.

The student will
8.01 identify common persuasion and propaganda techniques.
8.02 examine the content of various media products to determine the purposes and/or audiences for which they are designed.

Subject Area ***Language Arts***

Course Title ***English Honors II***

Course Number *1001350*

COURSE STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

After successfully completing this course, the student will be able to

1. Apply critical reading skills in analyzing literature.

   The student will
   - 1.01 identify logical generalizations and/or conclusions based upon a literary selection.
   - 1.02 assess the validity of a literary selection by comparing and contrasting the selection with other selections written about the same subject or theme.
   - 1.03 identify criteria for judging the relative worth of a literary selection (e.g., author's originality and purpose, literary standards, personal preferences).
   - 1.04 analyze and evaluate specific literary works.

2. Apply word study skills to determine meanings of advanced vocabulary words.

   The student will
   - 2.01 determine the meanings of words from knowledge of word parts and context clues.
   - 2.02 identify semantic properties of words (e.g., abstract/concrete; denotative/connotative).
   - 2.03 use reference sources to find information about words.
   - 2.04 make inferences necessary for completing verbal analogies.

3. Apply conventions of standard written English.

   The student will
   - 3.01 edit and revise written compositions to correct errors in sentence structure, usage, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.
   - 3.02 utilize available reference sources in finding information related to specific word and phrase usage.

4. Write compositions for a variety of purposes, using all stages of the writing process.

   The student will
   - 4.01 use prewriting, drafting, and revision skills in writing compositions.
   - 4.02 use appropriate logical thought patterns (e.g., comparison/contrast, cause-effect, definition, classification, analysis, order of importance, chronological order and/or spatial relationships).
   - 4.03 write formal and informal compositions for a variety of audiences and purposes, and in a variety of modes (e.g., narrative, descriptive, persuasive, and expository).
   - 4.04 write accurate, complete, and organized answers to essay questions.
   - 4.05 write to experiment with various forms and styles.

5. Analyze representative selections from various genres found in world literature.

The student will
- 5.01 read and discuss representative examples of literature from various national cultures.
- 5.02 identify recurring themes and concerns in world literature.
- 5.03 identify cultural differences as reflected in world literature.
- 5.04 analyze fictional works in terms of plot, setting, characterization, theme, conflict, and point of view.
- 5.05 identify literary devices used in poetry, fiction, drama, and essays.
- 5.06 evaluate literary works of various genres.
- 5.07 define literary terms applicable to the study of selections from world literature.

6. Make and critique formal oral presentations.

The student will
- 6.01 participate in class discussions.
- 6.02 summarize orally the content of a presentation.
- 6.03 give an oral presentation for a specific purpose and audience, using effective verbal and nonverbal techniques.
- 6.04 evaluate an oral presentation.

7. Critique various types of mass media.

The student will
- 7.01 identify propaganda techniques used in specific media presentations, including advertising.
- 7.02 examine the content of media programs to determine the purpose and/or audience for which they are designed.

8. Apply reference skills.

The student will
- 8.01 use appropriate note-taking skills.
- 8.02 locate reference sources appropriate to a specific topic.
- 8.03 develop a written paper or product utilizing information from various sources.